



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/258,302	02/26/1999	MASAYUKI INOUE	501.36884X00	3656

20457 7590 03/31/2003

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

LASTRA, DANIEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/258,302

Applicant(s)
Inoue et al

Examiner
James W. Myhre

Art Unit
3622



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James W. Myhre

(3) Carl I. Brundidge

(2) Dan Lastra

(4) _____

Date of Interview Mar 27, 2003

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative] (**COPY FAXED**)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: None

Identification of prior art discussed:

Takaragi et al (4,885,788) and Nori et al (5,659,166)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Appl. Rep. (AR) argued that Takaragi did not disclose the store inputting both a store identifier & the decypher code (IDC). The Examiner (EX) said that it was inherent that the store identify itself so that the IC card would know which transaction area to retrieve the stored DC (SDC) for comparison with the IDC. The AR argued that Takaragi used brute force to compare the IDC with each & every one of the transaction areas. However, in the cited example, the IDC is only compared to the SDC from one transaction area, after which the store is notified of a mismatch so it can take appropriate action. Thus, there is no support in the reference that the IDC is compared to the SDC in each of the transaction areas. Furthermore, Mori explicitly shows the store inputting a company code to identify itself when beginning the transaction. The AR argued that the steps involved were different. The EX noted that, it was old and well known for an entity to identify itself when attempting to gain access to files, such as transaction areas. No agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**JAMES W. MYHRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 3622**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required